

40% by weight of the composition of an organic solvent system that consists of a total of from about 7% to about 30% by weight of the organic solvent system of a water-miscible organic solvent and limited water-miscible organic solvent. In fact, Wierenga teaches that its compositions must contain greater than 20% by weight of the composition of a polyhydric alcohol (i.e., glycerol).

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 51, as amended, is not rendered obvious over Wierenga. MPEP 2143.03. Further, Applicants submit that Claims 52-68, 72-79 and 81-86, which ultimately depend from Claim 51, as amended, are not rendered obvious over Wierenga. MPEP 2143.03.

Claims 51-79 and 81-87 are rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC 103 as allegedly defining obvious subject matter over U.S. Patent No. 5,891,836 to Kacher ("Kacher"). The Examiner asserts that Kacher teaches a light-duty liquid or gel dishwashing detergent composition comprising a microemulsion forming glycol ether solvent, and amine oxide and monoethanolamine. Applicants respectfully submit that Kacher's composition further requires a liquid hydrocarbon.

Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 51, as amended, is not rendered obvious over Kacher because Kacher fails to teach each and every element of Claim 51, as amended. More particularly, Kacher fails to teach a composition that is free of liquid hydrocarbons and comprises from about 10% to about 40% by weight of the composition of an organic solvent system that consists of a total of from about 7% to about 30% by weight of the organic solvent system of a water-miscible organic solvent and limited water-miscible organic solvent.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 51, as amended, is not rendered obvious over Kacher. MPEP 2143.03. Further, Applicants submit that Claims 52-68, 72-79 and 81-87, which ultimately depend from Claim 51, as amended, are not rendered obvious over Kacher. MPEP 2143.03.

Claim 80 is rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC 103 as allegedly defining obvious subject matter over Kacher, discussed above, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,741,767 to Nicholson et al. ("Nicholson"). The Examiner recognizes that Kacher does not specifically teach the use of smectite clays. The Examiner attempts to overcome the deficiencies of Kacher by combining the teachings of Nicholson with Kacher. The Examiner asserts that Nicholson teaches a machine dishwashing composition comprising smectite clays.

Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 80, which ultimately depends from Claim 51, as amended, is not rendered obvious over Kacher in view of Nicholson for the same reasons that

Claim 51, as amended, and Claims 52-68, 72-79 and 81-87, which ultimately depend from Claim 51, as amended, are not rendered obvious over Kacher.

Claims 88-91 are rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC 103 as allegedly defining obvious subject matter over Kacher, discussed above, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,001,789 to Trinh et al. ("Trinh"). The Examiner recognizes that Kacher fails to teach ionones, musks and cyclodextrins in its compositions. The Examiner attempts to overcome the deficiencies of Kacher by combining the teachings of Trinh with Kacher. The Examiner asserts that Trinh teaches a cleaning composition comprising ionones, musks and cyclodextrin.

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 88-91, which ultimately depend from Claim 51, as amended, is not rendered obvious over Kacher in view of Trinh for the same reasons that Claim 51, as amended, and Claims 52-68, 72-79 and 81-87, which ultimately depend from Claim 51, as amended, are not rendered obvious over Kacher.

Provisional Double Patenting Rejection:

Claims 51-91 are provisionally rejected by the Examiner under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-42 of copending Application No. 09/909,403. Applicants respectfully submit this rejection is not ripe. Applicants submit that they will address this rejection, at such time this rejection becomes ripe. If a Terminal Disclaimer is needed, then Applicants will submit one.

Conclusion

WHEREAS Applicants have made an earnest effort to overcome the rejections of the claims, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections in light of the amendments and remarks contained herein and a notice of allowance of Claims 51-91.

Respectfully submitted,

PETER ROBERT FOLEY ET AL.



C. Brant Cook  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Registration No. 39,151  
(513) 627-2013

Customer # 27752  
Cincinnati, OH  
January 23, 2003  
CM2492AmdAftFinal

## MARKED UP VERSION OF CLAIMS

51. A hard surface cleaning composition for removing cooked-, baked-, or burnt-on soils from cookware and tableware, the composition comprising:

a) from about 10% to about 40% by weight of the composition of an organic [a] solvent system[comprising] consisting of:

i) from about 1% to about 15% by weight of the solvent system of an  
organoamine solvent;

ii) a water-miscible organic solvent; and

iii) a limited water-miscible organic solvent

wherein the water-miscible organic solvent and the limited water-miscible organic solvent are present in a combined level of from about 7% to about 30% by weight of the organic solvent system and are selected from the group consisting of:

alcohols, glycols, esters, glycol ethers, terpenes and mixtures thereof; and

wherein the weight ratio of the water-miscible organic solvent to the limited water-miscible organic solvent is from about 4:1 to about 1:20; and

b) water; and

c) optionally, a surfactant;

wherein the composition is free of liquid hydrocarbons.

72. The composition according to Claim 51 [71] wherein the solvent system comprises at least about 3.5% by weight of the composition of the water-miscible organic solvent.

73. The composition according to Claim 51 [71] wherein the solvent system comprises at least about 3.5% by weight of the composition of the limited water-miscible organic solvent.